

REMARKS

The following comments are responsive to the Non-final Office Action of June 23, 2009 (“Action”). Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested based on the above amendments and the below remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-12, 17-22, 25-29, 31-35, 38, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP Patent EP 0917355 A1 to Szucs et al. in view of WO Publication 02/11328 to Ikeda et al.

Claims 13, 14, 16, 23, 30, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szucs and Ikeda, in further view of US Patent 6,401,242 to Eyer et al.

Claims 15 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szucs, Ikeda, and Eyer, in further view of US Patent 5,671,219 to Jensen et al.

Claims 24, 37 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szucs and Ikeda, in further view of US Patent 6,695,770 B2 to Walsh et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

A. Comments on Claim 1

First, Applicants submit that the combination of Szucs and Ikeda, even if proper, fails to teach or suggest “splitting the at least one service information table into sub-tables, wherein each sub-table identifies a certain transport stream, and wherein said certain transport stream comprises a local transport stream of a certain cell,” as recited in claim 1. On page 3, the Action concedes that Szucs fails to disclose these claim features, and relies on Ikeda to remedy the deficiency. *See* Office Action, p. 3. The Action cites to Figure 8 of Ikeda, reproduced below, as purportedly disclosing the missing claim features.

SERVICE ID	SERVICE AREA ID
SERVICE 5	AREA 20
SERVICE 13	AREA 20
SERVICE 18	AREA 30

FIG.8

Applicants respectfully disagree.

The citations to Ikeda do not disclose the claimed table structure. Instead, the link information depicted in Figure 8 of Ikeda is a common table defining which services are available in multiple adjacent service areas, but Ikeda does not indicate that its link information is split into sub-tables each identifying a certain transport stream that comprises a local transport stream of a certain cell. For instance, Ikeda discloses that “link information has a table structure as shown in FIG. 8.” *See* Ikeda, C10, L28-29. Ikeda indicates “link information contains service area IDs for identifying the service areas adjacent to the original service area and service IDs for identifying the programs (services) to be linked in the respective adjacent service areas.” *Id.* at C10, L30-33. Thus, link information depicted in the table of Figure 8 provides information for more than one cell, but Ikeda does not describe splitting the link information of Figure 8 into sub-tables each identifying a certain transport stream that comprises a local transport stream of a certain cell. As such, the combination of Scuzs and Ikeda, even if proper, does not disclose “splitting the at least one service information table into sub-tables, wherein each sub-table identifies a certain transport stream, and wherein said certain transport stream comprises a local transport stream of a certain cell,” as in claim 1.

Second, Applicants submit that the combination of Szucs and Ikeda, even if proper, fails to teach or suggest “a mother table configured to maintain a sub-table of the certain transport stream and sub-tables of adjacent transport streams of the certain transport stream.” An example of a mother table is described in Figure 3 of the instant application where the mother table contains references to multiple sub-tables. On pages 3-4, the Action concedes that Szucs

fails to disclose the claimed mother table, and relies on Ikeda to remedy the deficiency. The Action cites to Figure 8 of Ikeda, reproduced above, as purportedly disclosing the claimed mother table. Applicants respectfully disagree. Instead of the “service-area” relationship described in Figure 8 of Ikeda, the claimed mother table provides a “sub-table-area” relationship to “maintain a sub-table of the certain transport stream and sub-tables of adjacent transport streams of the certain transport stream,” as claimed. Thus, the table structure in Figure 8 of Ikeda does not teach or suggest the relationship between sub-tables of the claimed mother table. As such, the combination of Szucs and Ikeda, even if proper, fails to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1 and hence do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

B. Comments on Pending Claims 2-32 and 40-44

Applicants submit that claims 2-32 and 40-44 are allowable for at least some reasons analogous to those given in support of claim 1, in addition to the features they recite.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: September 23, 2009

By: /Christopher M. Swickhamer/
Christopher M. Swickhamer
Registration No. 59,853
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Fax: 312-463-5001